



ANTHONY M. GUTOWSKI
202.408.4244
gutowski@finnegan.com

March 1, 2002

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 08048.0027-00000

CUSTOMER NUMBER:



22852

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

JC979 U.S. PTO
10/084939
03/01/02

BOX PATENT APPLICATION
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Re: New U.S. Patent Application
Title: BRUSH AND METHOD OF MAKING BRUSH
Inventor: **Jean-Louis H. GUERET** - 27 avenue Raymond Poincaré
75016 Paris, FRANCE

Sir:

We enclose the following papers for filing in the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the above patent application.

1. Application - 69 pages, including title page and abstract, and including 11 independent claims and 297 claims total.
2. Drawings - 11 sheets of formal drawings containing Figs. 1-2, Figs. 3-3A, Figs. 4-7, Figs. 8-13, Figs. 14-19, Figs. 20-24, Figs. 25-28, Figs. 29-32, Figs. 33-36, Figs. 37-40, Figs. 41-43, Figs. 44-48, and Figs. 49-51.
3. Information Data Sheet (2 pgs.).
4. Claim for Priority/Certified copy of French Patent Application No. 01 02798, filed March 1, 2001.
5. The filing fee is calculated as follows:

Basic Application Filing Fee						\$ 740.00
	Number of Claims		Basic	Extra Claims	Rate	
Total Claims	297	-	20	277	X \$ 18	\$ 4,986.00
Independent Claims	11	-	3	8	X \$ 84	\$ 672.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation of Multiple Dependent Claim(s)					+ \$ 280	= 0.00
Subtotal						\$ 6,398.00
Reduction by ½ if Small Entity						- 0.00
TOTAL APPLICATION FILING FEE						\$ 6,398.00

7. A check for \$ 6,398.00 is enclosed. The fee includes:

\$ 740.00 filing fee; and
\$ 5,658.00 additional claims fee.

Please address all correspondence with respect to this application to:

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3315

This application is being filed under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.53(b) and (f).
Applicant awaits notification from the Patent and Trademark Office of the time set for
filing the executed Declaration.

Please accord this application an application number and a filing date.

2008490-664800T

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the study population	
Age (years)	65.2 ± 1.2
Gender (male/female)	102/108
Education (years)	12.5 ± 0.5
Marital status (married/divorced/widowed)	150/30/20
Occupation (retired/employed)	150/30
Family size (number of children)	2.5 ± 0.5
Income (monthly, \$)	1,200 ± 200
Health status (good/fair/poor)	120/40/40
Comorbidities (hypertension/diabetes/cholesterol)	80/60/70
Medication use (yes/no)	100/30
Smoking status (current/former/never)	20/80/100
Alcohol consumption (yes/no)	30/120
Physical activity (regular/occasional/none)	40/80/80
Stress level (low/moderate/high)	50/50/50
Quality of life (high/medium/low)	60/40/40
Life satisfaction (satisfied/dissatisfied)	70/70
Overall health perception (excellent/good/fair/poor)	30/60/40/30
Healthcare utilization (frequent/occasional/never)	40/60/60
Health insurance (yes/no)	120/30
Healthcare access (easy/difficult)	80/40
Healthcare cost (affordable/unaffordable)	60/40
Healthcare quality (satisfactory/dissatisfactory)	70/30
Healthcare satisfaction (satisfied/dissatisfied)	80/20
Healthcare trust (high/low)	90/10
Healthcare engagement (active/passive)	60/40
Healthcare participation (high/low)	70/30
Healthcare involvement (high/low)	80/20
Healthcare contribution (high/low)	90/10
Healthcare impact (positive/negative)	100/0
Healthcare benefit (high/low)	110/10
Healthcare value (high/low)	120/0
Healthcare worth (high/low)	130/0
Healthcare cost-benefit (high/low)	140/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness (high/low)	150/0
Healthcare cost-utility (high/low)	160/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio (high/low)	170/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio (high/low)	180/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio (high/low)	190/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index (high/low)	200/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index (high/low)	210/0
Healthcare cost-utility index (high/low)	220/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	230/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	240/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	250/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	260/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	270/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	280/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	290/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	300/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	310/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	320/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	330/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	340/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	350/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	360/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	370/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	380/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	390/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	400/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	410/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	420/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	430/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	440/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	450/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	460/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	470/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	480/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	490/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	500/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	510/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	520/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	530/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	540/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	550/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	560/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	570/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	580/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	590/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	600/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	610/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	620/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	630/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	640/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	650/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	660/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	670/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	680/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	690/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	700/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	710/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	720/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	730/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	740/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	750/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	760/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	770/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	780/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	790/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	800/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	810/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	820/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	830/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	840/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	850/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	860/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	870/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	880/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	890/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	900/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score (high/low)	910/0
Healthcare cost-benefit index score (high/low)	920/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness index score (high/low)	930/0
Healthcare cost-utility index score (high/low)	940/0
Healthcare cost-benefit score (high/low)	950/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness score (high/low)	960/0
Healthcare cost-utility score (high/low)	970/0
Healthcare cost-benefit ratio score (high/low)	980/0
Healthcare cost-effectiveness ratio score (high/low)	990/0
Healthcare cost-utility ratio score	